## REMARKS

The Examiner objected to the drawings for not showing the bevel between 60 and 85 degrees. The Applicant is not claiming this feature, therefore the Applicant submits that this does not need to be shown in the drawings.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. The Applicant has amended the claims to remove the objectionable language regarding the first and second radiuses. The Applicant submits that the claims comply with the second paragraph of §112.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 14, 17, 18 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(3) as being anticipated by Toh. The Examiner rejected claims 1-8, 10, 12, 13 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Heimann. The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heimann in further view of Cross. The Examiner rejected claims 14-21, 23, 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toh in view of Heimann. The Examiner rejected claims 22 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Toh in view of Heimann and in further view of Cross. The claims have been amended to recite a ring with an inner radial surface having a radius of curvature that is between 40 to 85% of a thickness of the ring. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose this limitation. Consequently, none of the cited references either anticipate or render obvious the claims.

The above entitled application discloses and claims a snap ring that is used in hard disk drives. As discussed on pages 19 and 20 of the above entitled application, when a snap ring is "snapped" into place, it may shear components of the drive to create contaminants.

Contaminants are very undesirable in a hard disk drive. By way of example, referring to Fig. 4 of the above entitled application, as the ring 83 moves down the cone 42, it may strike location 89 of the actuator pivot bearing sleeve flange 46. The amended claims recite a rounded surface with a curvature that will prevent contact between the ring and location 89 as the ring snaps into place. This desired result is clearly stated on page 20, lines 10-14 of the above entitled application. None of the references cited by the Examiner disclose or suggest to provide an inner radial surface having a radius of curvature between 40 to 85% of a thickness of a ring to ensure that there is no contact between the ring and a hard drive component during the assembly within a hard disk drive. For these reasons, the Applicant submits that claims are patentably distinct from the prior art.

In view of the above it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested. Allowance of claims 1 and 14 at an early date is solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

IRELL & MANELLA LLP

Dated: April 28, 2006

Ben J. Yorks, Reg. No. 33,609

840 Newport Center Drive
Suite 400
Newport Beach, CA 92660-6324
(949) 760-0991

Certificate of Mailing

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on April 28, 2006

Susan M. Langworthy